

## **SUMMARY OF INTERPRETATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION**

North Central Region Cooperative Soil Survey Conference  
Madison, Wisconsin  
June 24-27, 2002

**IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT THERE WAS NOT CONSENSUS AMONG THE COMMITTEE MUCH LESS THE ENTIRE NCRCSS, BUT GENERALLY, A MAJORITY AGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS.**

### **Charge 1. What New Interpretations are Needed?**

- **A redesigned interp for septic systems using soil loading rates**
- **Rewrite rules for sand and gravel interp**
- **Storm water infiltration interp for urban users using subsurface permeability and surface bulk density**
- **Describe kind of bedrock in NASIS (e.g. shale, limestone, basalt, etc.) to generate better interps for seepage, etc.**
- **Compaction susceptibility interp**

**It was recommended that Mike Sucik would draft a letter to Karl Hipple, National Leader for Interpretations requesting development of some of these interps.**

### **Charge 2. How Should Interpretations Be Presented**

- **The terms slight, moderate and severe are no longer adequate. Fuzzy logic ratings thus far are very inadequate. Most fuzzy interps maybe list 2-4 numbers at best. There is a need for a true sliding scale where any of the possible 100 fuzzy number can be generated.**
- **Most soil scientists have not worked with NASIS enough to be proficient at designing and writing reports. Sucik feels it's possible to design a report any way you want provided all of the elements are in the NASIS database. A report that mirrors the old SIR should be possible.**
- **Some interps could provide alternatives. For example, if a soil is not limited for septic systems, all types of septic systems would be listed. As soil limitations increase, certain design systems would be eliminated steering the user to the most appropriate system for that soil type.**
- **Graphic interpretations would be of value. If water table is displayed graphically, user could watch water table rise and lower as cursor slides across months. This report will be shared with New Technology Committee.**
- **Consider menu driven interpretation base where user selects properties and interpretations to generate applicable tables. Incorporate search engine into interp generator.**
- **Attach explanation of the science behind the interp to each interp, possibly linking the existing interp to research that verifies the result. Explains to user why some soils are limited or not for specific uses.**

### **Charge 3. Interpretation Standards**

- **Review interpretive criteria to see if still valid. Most were established 25 years ago. Is there newer science or performance data that warrants changes.**
- **Need clearinghouse where sample interps are stored. Different from soil data warehouse. So many folks writing NASIS reports, some wheels are getting reinvented 2 or 3 times. How do we know or go about finding what interps have been written without scrolling through thousands of reports. In addition, report name does not tell us what's in it.**
- **Attach explanation of the science behind the interp to each interp, possibly linking the existing interp to research that verifies the result. Explains to user why some soils are limited or not for specific uses.**
- **Propose formation of a mechanism to ensure more consistency of interpretations across state lines. This is a role for the MO's or SBAAG. All states should be represented. Currently, each state is doing their own thing. MO concept was established to reduce inconsistencies. Thus far, they have not taken an active role to ensure consistency of interps. We propose a committee is established with each state represented to evaluate and develop uniform standards. Regional Technology Specialist has done little or nothing to help achieve this. What is their role? Communication between state is seriously lacking. New Technology Committee expressed the same frustration.**
- **Alternative to above would be to develop a smaller set of National interps that are needed to support agency programs. States could then develop their own, however, communication is still needed to avoid replications and inconsistencies.**
- **Redefine SSURGO to include only spatial layer. Tabular data would be responsibility of state. Post only spatial layer on Fort Worth server with instructions to contact state soil scientist for attributes.**

### **Charge 4. Interpretations Object. Should NASIS structure accommodate an interpretations object?**

- **Redefine definition of what constitutes a perfect join to only include soil properties.**
- **Interpretations object is needed to accommodate interpretations that vary across state lines due to state and local laws. Also allow states to stay with their traditional slope ranges and still consider a perfect join. Climatic factors are also reported along county boundaries and they should be because climate will change from North to South or West to East within any MLRA, county subset, etc.**